

REMARKS

Claims 21 to 23, 25 to 35, 37 to 47 and 49 to 58 are pending. Claim 56 is objected to for incorrect grammar. Claims 42 and 56 to 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated. Claims 21 to 23, 25 to 35, 37 to 47, 49 to 56 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Applicants have amended Claim 56 to correct the grammar. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claim 56.

Claims 21, 32, 42, 45 and 56 are amended to include limitations that were inherent when the claims were read as a whole in view of, for example, Page 15, lines 7 to 13 of the specification as filed. This is done to avoid discussions on whether Applicants are requesting the Examiner to read limitations into the claims.

Claims 42 and 56 to 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,420,991, hereinafter referred to as Konigsfeld.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 42 in view of Konigsfeld. The rejection relies upon Col. 4 lines 22 to 30 as teaching exactly the read-after-write hazard field of Claim 42.

Konigsfeld taught "Each load operation is tagged with the Store Buffer ID (SBID) of the store previous to it." at Col. 4, lines 24, 25. This not only fails to teach the invention in the same level of detail as recited in Claim 42 but teaches away from the invention. As recited in Claim 42 "each bit in said read-after-write hazard field corresponds to a different entry in a store buffer." The SBID of Konigsfeld corresponds to a single entry in the store buffer. In addition, the SBID is an identifier and does not have a state based upon the execution state of the entry in store buffer relative to the instruction including the read-after-write hazard field.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal

of the anticipation rejection of Claim 42 in view of Konigsfeld.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 56 in view of Konigsfeld, the comments with respect to Claim 42 are applicable and incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 56 in view of Konigsfeld.

Claims 57 and 58 depend from Claim 56 and so distinguish over Konigsfeld for at least the same reasons as Claim 56. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 57 and 58 in view of Konigsfeld.

Claims 21 to 23, 25 to 35, 37 to 47, 49 to 56 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,168,564, hereinafter referred to as Barlow, in view Konigsfeld.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 21, 32, 42, 45, and 56. Assuming arguendo the combination of references is correct, as noted above the SBID of Konigsfeld teaches away from the read-after-write hazard field as defined in each of these claims and so the combination fails to suggest or disclose the inventions recited in these claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 21, 32, 42, 45 and 56 in view of Barlow and Konigsfeld.

Claims 22, 23 and 25 to 31 depend from Claim 21 and so distinguish over Barlow and Konigsfeld for at least the same reasons as Claim 21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 22, 23 and 25 to 31 in view of Barlow and Konigsfeld.

Claims 33 to 35 and 37 to 41 depend from Claim 32 and so distinguish over Barlow and Konigsfeld for at least the same

reasons as Claim 32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 33 to 35 and 37 to 41 in view of Barlow and Konigsfeld.

Claims 46, 47 and 49 to 55 depend from Claim 45 and so distinguish over Barlow and Konigsfeld for at least the same reasons as Claim 45. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 46, 47 and 49 to 55 in view of Barlow and Konigsfeld.

Claims 43 and 44 depend from Claim 42 and so distinguish over Barlow and Konigsfeld for at least the same reasons as Claim 42. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 43 and 44 in view of Barlow and Konigsfeld.

Claim 58 depends from Claim 56 and so distinguishes over Barlow and Konigsfeld for at least the same reasons as Claim 56. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 58 in view of Barlow and Konigsfeld.

Claims 21 to 23, 25 to 35, 37 to 47 and 49 to 58 remain in the application. Claims 21, 32, 42, 45, and 56 have been amended. Claims 1 to 20, 24, 36 and 48 were canceled previously. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 15, 2008.



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

August 15, 2008  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison

Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880